REMARKS

By way of overview, claims 1-47 have been examined, with claims 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-27, 31-37, 39-45, and 47 rejected, and claims 9, 18, 21, 28-30, 38, and 46 objected to.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9, 18, 21, 28-30, 38, and 46.

The original claims were numbered such that there were two claims numbered as claims 42 and 43, respectively. Applicant has renumbered the claims to remove the duplicate numbers 42 and 43 and to make the claim numbering consistent with the Examiner's numbering of the claims during examination. That is, Applicant has renumbered the original claims 42, 43, 42, 43, 44, and 45 to be 42, 43, 45, 46, and 47, respectively.

Turning to the substance of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-27, 31-37, 39-45, and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,608) in view of Buskens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,250). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

The claims are directed to a wireless communication method and system for hosting a plurality of processes, each process in the plurality of processes executed in accordance with a communication protocol, the communication protocol including a set of functions. The system has a plurality of application specific instruction set processors (ASISPs) and a scheduler or centralized controller. Each ASISP is capable of executing a subset of the set of functions included in the communication protocol. The scheduler or centralized controller is connected to the plurality of ASISPs for scheduling the plurality of ASISPs in accordance with a scheduling scheme or time-slicing algorithm so that each process in the plurality of processes is supported by the wireless communication system. Alternatively, the scheduler or centralized controller schedules the functions calculated by each ASISP in a master/slave relationship, thereby reducing the amount of inter-process overhead between the computing components in the device.

Bouis is directed to a completely different system from the present invention. That is, Boius is directed to multimedia conversion, and more specifically to a transcoder system wherein a controller selects and arranges multimedia conversion modules in a series to provide conversion from a source multimedia format to a destination multimedia format. (Col. 2, lines 27-31.) Bouis' main focus is converting streaming video and audio over the internet. (Col. 1, line 66, through col. 2, line 9.)

Because Bouis is directed to a completely different system from the present invention, there are many claimed features not taught or suggested by Bouis. For example, Bouis does not suggest a plurality of processes executed in accordance with a communication protocol, as required by the claims. A communication protocol is a set of rules governing the format of communications between a mobile phone and a base station. Examples of communications protocols include TDMA (time division multiple access) and CDMA (code division multiple access). Bouis does not in any way relate to such protocols. Again, Bouis discusses converting multimedia from one format to another.

Bouis also does not teach or suggest a plurality of application specific instruction set processors (ASISPs), as also required by the claimed invention. An ASISP is a specific type of device that is different from a dedicated hardware architecture and different from a software architecture (programmable CPU based). An ASISP takes the best features of both of these architectures and combines them into a single architecture - the ASISPs architecture. The modules in Bouis to which the Examiner refers are basic modules in a computer system; they are clearly not the very specific type of processor known as ASISPs.

Further, even were Bouis' modules equivalent to the claimed ASISPs, Bouis still would not suggest an ASISP capable of executing a subset of a set of functions included in a communication protocol, as also required by the claims. Such a feature is advantageous in that memory requirements and computation ability of a class of ASISPs is scaled to match the demands of the applications designed to run on the class of ASISPs. Bouis' modules are each dedicated to a specific function, such as data compression, data decompression, data encryption, data decryption,

data format conversion, , data media conversion, or data signaling processing. (Paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3.) There is no disclosure in Bouis that a single module can execute a subset of a set of functions.

The Examiner cites Buskens for its alleged teaching of a wireless communication system having a plurality of processors. While Buskens may have a plurality of processors, it does not suggest the very specific type of processors as claimed, that is the ASISPs. Thus, Buskens fails to make up for Bouis' deficiencies.

Many of the dependent claims recite further details of the claimed invention, and particularly the ASISPs. Since the applied references do not suggest ASISPs, it necessarily follows that they also do not suggest the details of the ASISPs.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: August 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _Laura C. Brutman_
Laura C. Brutman
    Registration No.: 38,395
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant